

Scaling of the Conductivity with Temperature and Uniaxial Stress in Si:B at the Metal-Insulator Transition.

S. Bogdanovich and M. P. Sarachik

Physics Department, City College of the City University of New York, New York, New York 10031

R. N. Bhatt

Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544-5263

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

Using uniaxial stress, S , to tune Si:B through the metal-insulator transition at a critical value S_c , we find the dc conductivity at low temperatures shows an excellent fit to the scaling form $\sigma(S, T) = AT^x f[(S - S_c)/T^y]$ on both sides of the transition. The scaling functions yield the conductivity in the metallic and insulating phases, and allow a reliable determination of the temperature dependence in the critical regions on both sides of the transition.

PACS numbers: 71.30.+h

The metal-insulator transition in doped semiconductors and amorphous metal-semiconductor mixtures is a continuous quantum phase transition which occurs in the limit of zero temperature. A scaling approach similar to that used for continuous phase transitions driven by temperature, within which the properties of the system do not depend on microscopic details and are controlled by a diverging length scale, suggests that the conductivity in the vicinity of the transition (critical) point can be described by a scaling form:

$$\sigma(t, T) = \sigma_c(T) f[(t - t_c)/T^y]. \quad (1)$$

where t is the control parameter (such as dopant concentration, magnetic field or uniaxial stress) that drives the transition at the critical value $t = t_c$, and

$$\sigma_c(T) = AT^x \quad (2)$$

is the low-temperature limit of the conductivity at the critical point. By identifying the diverging time scale τ at the transition with $\hbar/kT$, and assuming conventional dynamical scaling $\tau \propto \xi^z$, where $\xi(t) \propto (t - t_c)^{-\nu}$ is the diverging correlation length scale as the transition is approached, one easily obtains $y = 1/z\nu$, and $x = \mu/z\nu$, where μ is the critical exponent characterizing the onset of metallic conductivity at zero temperature:

$$\sigma(t, T \rightarrow 0) \propto (t - t_c)^\mu. \quad (3)$$

The applicability of this scaling formulation [1] to the metal-insulator transition was first demonstrated for non-interacting electrons by Wegner [2] and by Abrahams *et al.* [3], and subsequently extended to incorporate electron-electron interactions by many, including McMillan [4], Finkel'shtein [5], Castellani *et al.* [6], and Belitz and Kirkpatrick [7]. Within this theoretical framework, the values of the critical exponents μ , ν and z are determined by the symmetry of the effective field theory, and depend on the presence or absence of symmetry-breaking fields, such as magnetic field, spin-orbit interactions, or magnetic impurities, which determine the universality class of the system [8,9].

The problem of metal-insulator transitions has a venerable history [10]. Data for amorphous metal-semiconductor mixtures [11], magnetic semiconductors [12], and heavily compensated persistent photoconductors, [13], all suggest an exponent $\mu \approx 1$. In contrast, although the continuous nature of the transition was first demonstrated in uncompensated doped Si and despite considerable effort over more than two decades, a consensus regarding the critical behavior in uncompensated doped semiconductors has yet to emerge [14]. There continues to be debate concerning a number of fundamental issues. Thus, for example, (i) the value of the critical conductivity exponent μ has been variously cited as equal to 1/2 and 1; (ii) the breadth of the critical regime, and thus the range of the critical parameter t one can safely use to determine the exponent is not known; and (iii) the form of $\sigma_c(T)$ in the critical region very near the transition has been claimed to be $\propto T^{1/2}$ and $\propto T^{1/3}$ [15].

The procedure generally used to determine the critical exponent μ entails measuring the conductivity to as low a temperature as possible to obtain a single extrapolated $T=0$ value to be used in the fit to Eq. (3). In contrast, full scaling with temperature, Eq. (1), obviates the need for potentially unreliable extrapolations to $T=0$ and yields a determination of μ based on all data taken at all temperatures. Inspection of published data for amorphous metal-semiconductor mixtures such as NbSi, [11] and the persistent photoconductor $\text{Al}_{0.3}$

Ga_{0.7}As, [13] indicates that the conductivity of these systems obeys Eq. (1) in the metallic phase [16,17]. On the other hand, the conductivity of Si:P measured by Paalanen *et al.* [19] down to several mK does not obey scaling, while approximate temperature scaling has been reported by Stupp *et al.* [20] on the metallic side very near the transition in the same system.

In this paper we report conductivity measurements obtained using uniaxial stress to tune through the metal-insulator transition in Si:B. As demonstrated by Paalanen *et al.* [19] in their classic experiments in Si:P, uniaxial stress allows very fine control in a single sample, and gives precise relative determinations of the critical parameter t . For a closely spaced set of stresses S near the critical stress S_c , we demonstrate that the conductivity of Si:B obeys scaling, Eq. (1), on both sides of the metal-insulator transition. We show that the conductivity in the critical regime is consistent with $\sigma_c \propto T^{1/2}$. This is the same temperature dependence as has been calculated [21] and observed [19] in the perturbative region on the metallic side (weakly disordered metal). On the insulating side, we find that the conductivity crosses over to $\sigma \propto \exp(T^*/T)^{1/2}$, the form expected for variable-range hopping in the presence of Coulomb interactions [22], with a prefactor $\propto T^{1/2}$ corresponding to the temperature-dependence of the critical curve.

A bar-shaped 8.0x1.25x0.3 mm³ sample of Si:B was cut with its long dimension along the [001] direction. The dopant concentration, determined from the ratio of the resistivities [23] at 300 K and 4.2 K, was $4.84 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Electrical contact was made along four thin boron-implanted strips. Uniaxial compression was applied to the sample along the long [001] direction using a pressure cell described elsewhere [23]. Four-terminal measurements were taken at 13 Hz (equivalent to DC) for different fixed values of uniaxial stress at temperatures between 0.05 and 0.76 K. Measurements were restricted to the linear region of the I-V curves.

Si:B is considerably more sensitive to stress than Si:P [24]. This is because the acceptor state in Si:B has a four-fold degeneracy in the unstressed cubic phase, which is lifted by uniaxial stress into two doublets, each retaining only the Kramers degeneracy. By contrast, the six-fold valley degeneracy (on top of the required Kramers or spin degeneracy) of an effective mass donor in Si has already been removed (even in zero stress) by the central-cell correction of the phosphorus dopants [25]. A consequence of the additional degeneracy in Si:B is that uniaxial compressive stress drives metallic Si:B into the insulating phase, unlike Si:P where (relatively larger) stresses drive an insulating sample through the transition into the metallic phase. This is in qualitative agreement with predictions for effective mass donor systems which take into account mass anisotropy [26] as well as degeneracy in the presence of electron correlation [27].

The conductivity of Si:B measured at 4.2 K was found to be a linear function of stress. Since the conductivity at 4.2 K is also approximately linear with dopant concentration for concentrations near the transition, it follows that $(S - S_c) \propto (n - n_c)$, and either may be used as the control parameter ($t - t_c$) in the scaling equations (1) and (3). It has generally been assumed that the same value of the critical conductivity exponent μ should then be obtained by varying stress or dopant concentration.

The conductivity as a function of temperature is shown on a log-log scale in Fig. 1 for twenty selected values of the uniaxial stress (data were taken for other stress values not shown). The upper curves bend upward as the temperature is decreased, tending toward finite (metallic) conductivities at $T=0$, while the lower curves are concave downward, indi-

cating that they are in the insulating phase. On a log-log scale the critical curve at $S = S_c$ is a straight line heading toward $\sigma = 0$ at $T = 0$, and follows a power-law.

Fits to full S-T scaling, Eq. (1), were carried out for different choices of S_c ranging between 560 and 726 bar. Figure 2 shows a scaled plot of σ/σ_c versus $T/(\Delta S/S_c)^{0.31}$ (where $\Delta S = S - S_c$) for the best choice, $S_c = 613$ bar, yielding exponents $x = 0.5$ and $y = 0.31$. The conductivity at the critical point $S = S_c$ thus exhibits a square root dependence on temperature. A dependence $\propto T^{1/3}$, claimed for several other systems at the critical point $t = t_c$, [15] is decidedly inconsistent with our data in stressed Si:B. In terms of the standard exponents, one obtains $\mu = 1.6$ and $z\nu = 3.2$. If we further assume (as is generally done) [28], that $\mu = \nu$, it follows that the dynamical exponent $z = 2.0$.

The conductivity in the insulating phase, normalized to the critical conductivity, is plotted in Fig. 3 on a semilogarithmic scale as a function of $(T^*/T)^{1/2}$, where $T^* \propto (\Delta S)^y$. For $T^*/T > 10$, the conductivity obeys the exponentially-activated hopping form predicted by Efros and Shklovskii [22] in the presence of a gap in the density of states due to electron-electron interactions, with a temperature-dependent prefactor given by the critical curve, namely:

$$\sigma(T) \propto T^{1/2} \exp[(T^*/T)^{1/2}]. \quad (4)$$

Deviations are evident for $T^*/T < 10$. In this regime hopping energies are comparable or larger than the energy width of the Coulomb gap, and a crossover has been suggested and observed to Mott variable-range-hopping with an exponent $1/4$ rather than $1/2$. The inset, which shows normalized conductivity as a function of $(T^*/T)^{1/4}$, demonstrates that Mott hopping is not observed in uncompensated Si:B for any range of T^*/T .

We now examine the behavior of the conductivity on the metallic side. Eq. (1) can be rewritten as:

$$\sigma(t, T) = (S - S_c)^\mu f'[T/(S - S_c)^{z\nu}]. \quad (5)$$

with a different universal function f' . The ratio $\sigma(t, T)/(\Delta S/S_c)^\mu$ is shown as a function of $T^{1/2}/(\Delta S/S_c)^{z\nu/2}$ in Fig. 4. The conductivity is everywhere consistent with the form calculated in the weak disorder regime (where perturbative calculations are valid) [21], namely:

$$\sigma(T) = \sigma(0) + BT^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

with $\sigma(0) \propto (S - S_c)^\mu$.

The critical conductivity exponent $\mu = 1.6$ found in our experiments is considerably larger than other determinations, which range between 0.5 [19,29] and (at most) 1.3 [30] in uncompensated doped semiconductors [14]. We caution that a direct comparison may not be warranted for several reasons. Given the sensitivity of Si:B to uniaxial stress, it is possible that small stress variations result in an inhomogeneous stress distribution and a consequent averaging over a sample consisting of portions that are at different “distances” t from the transition. This could “smear” the transition and yield a large value of μ ; however, if inhomogeneities were sufficiently serious to cause a measurable increase in μ , they would probably cause measurable deviations from scaling as well. It is important to note also that the temperature dependence of stressed and unstressed samples of comparable conductivities are unambiguously different [23]. This suggests that the question of “universality” of the

critical exponent obtained using stress or dopant concentration to tune the transition needs to be examined in more detail.

It has been suggested recently [31] that disordered systems may violate the Chayes et al. [32] inequality $\nu \geq 2/d$ (as some of these uncompensated semiconductors appear to); self averaging breaks down for such systems. The system would then become inhomogeneous as the critical point is approached, which could imply that the transition is ultimately of the percolation type. The conductivity exponent 1.6 obtained in our experiments is close to that expected for classical percolation in three dimensions; however, these ideas need to be examined in more detail, and other factors must be ruled out.

To summarize, scaling provides an excellent description of the conductivity near the metal-insulator transition in uniaxially stressed Si:B. Based on data at many values of stress and temperature, the scaling functions in the insulating and metallic phases yield particularly reliable determinations of the conductivity both within and outside the critical region. Although comparison between different systems continues to be problematical, we have shown for the first time that full temperature-stress scaling on both sides gives internally consistent results for the metal-insulator transition in a doped semiconductor.

We are grateful to D. Simonian and S. V. Kravchenko for their participation in some phases of these experiments. We acknowledge valuable experimental contributions by A. Diop and L. Walkowicz. Our heartfelt thanks go to G. A. Thomas for his generous support and expert advice, help and interest throughout this project. We thank T. A. Rosenbaum, M. Paalanen, E. Smith and S. Han for valuable experimental advice and the loan of equipment, and F. Pollak for useful suggestions and some samples. M. P. S. thanks G. Kotliar and D. Belitz for numerous discussions. This work was supported by the US Department of Energy Grant No. DE-FG02-84ER45153. R. N. B. was supported by NSF grant No. DMR-9400362.

REFERENCES

- [1] This has sometimes been referred to as dynamical scaling because of the appearance of the dynamical exponent z ; we refer to it as temperature-stress scaling, reserving the term “dynamical” to describe scaling of the finite-frequency conductivity.
- [2] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **25**, 327 (1976).
- [3] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).
- [4] W. L. McMillan, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 2739 (1981).
- [5] A. M. Finkelshtein, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **84**, 168 (1983) [Sov. Phys. JETP **57**, 97 (1983)].
- [6] C. Castellani, G. Kotliar, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 323 (1987).
- [7] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. **41**, 11082 (1990).
- [8] For excellent reviews, see P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985); D. Belitz and T. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 261 (1994).
- [9] The analysis presented in this paper is in terms of the general scaling form Eq. 1, with exponents x and y ; only in the identification of these exponents with the conventional exponents ν and z will there be the additional implicit assumptions concerning the scaling of the diverging time scale with temperature.
- [10] N. F. Mott, Metal-Insulator Transitions, Taylor and Francis, London, 1974).
- [11] D. J. Bishop, E. G. Spencer, and R. C. Dynes, Solid State Electronics **28**, 73 (1985).
- [12] S. von Molnar, A. Briggs, J. Flouquet and G. Remenyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 706 (1983).
- [13] S. Katsumoto, F. Komori, N. Sano, and S. Kobayashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn, **56**, 2259 (1987).
- [14] M. P. Sarachik, in *Metal-Insulator Transitions Revisited*, ed. by P. P. Edwards and C. N. Rao (Taylor and Francis, London, 1995).
- [15] See, for example, M. Maliepaard, M. Pepper, R. Newbury, J. E. F. Frost, D. C. Peacock, D. A. Ritchie, G. A. C. Jones, and G. Hill, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 1430 (1989); I. Shlimak, M. Kaveh, R. Ussyshkin, V. Ginodman, and L. Resnick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1103 (1996).
- [16] In these materials, the conductivity plotted as a function of square root of temperature gives a family of parallel lines for different dopant concentrations in the metallic phase, and thus clearly obey scaling with temperature and concentration in the metal.
- [17] Scaling of the metallic conductivity has been reported in $\text{Ni}(\text{S},\text{Se})_2$, a system that undergoes a Mott-Hubbard transition, by A. Husmann, D. S. Jin, Y. V. Zastavker, T. F. Rosenbaum, X. Yao, and J. M. Honig, Science **274**, 1874 (1996).
- [18] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 13 922 (1995).
- [19] M. A. Paalanen, T. F. Rosenbaum, G. A. Thomas, and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1284 (1982).
- [20] H. Stupp, M. Hornung, M. Lakner, O. Madel, and H. v. Lohneysen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2122 (1994).
- [21] B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **77**, 2028 (1979) [Sov. Phys. JETP **50**, 968 (1979); Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **30**, 514 (1979) [Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. **30**, 514 (1979); Solid State Commun. **46**, 429 (1983)].
- [22] B. I. and Shklovskii and A. L. Efros, in *Electronic Properties of Doped Semiconductors*, Solid State Series Vol. **45** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1984).
- [23] S. Bogdanovich, Thesis (City College of CUNY, 1998).
- [24] J. C. Hensel and G. Feher, Phys. Rev. Rev. **129**, 1041 (1963); H. Hasegawa, Phys. Rev.

- 129**, 1029 (1963); J. A. Chroboczek, F. H. Pollak, and H. F. Staunton, *Phil. Mag. B* **50**, 113 (1984).
- [25] R. N. Bhatt, *Phys. Rev. B* **26**, 1082 (1982).
 - [26] R. N. Bhatt, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 3630 (1981).
 - [27] R. N. Bhatt and S. Sachdev, *Phys. Rev. B* **34**, 3520 (1986).
 - [28] Controversy regarding this equality exists only when there is no symmetry breaking field (pure potential scattering in the absence of a magnetic field), and the renormalization group flows scale to strong coupling.
 - [29] K. M. Itoh, E. E. Haller, *et al.*, **77**, 4058 (1996).
 - [30] H. Stupp, M. Hornung, M. Lakner, O. Madel, and H. v. Lohneysen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 2634 (1993).
 - [31] F. Pazmandi, R. T. Scalettar, and G. Zimanyi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5130 (1997).
 - [32] J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, D. S. Fisher, and T. Spencer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 2999 (1986).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Resistivity versus temperature on a log-log scale for different values of stress.

FIG. 2. σ/σ_c versus the scaling variable $(\Delta S/S_c)/T^y$ on a log-log scale, with $y = 1/(\nu z) = 0.31$.

FIG. 3. For the insulating phase, σ/σ_c versus $(T^*/T)^{1/2}$ on a semilogarithmic scale. The inset shows σ/σ_c versus $(T^*/T)^{1/4}$.

FIG. 4. For the metallic phase, $\sigma/[(\Delta S)/S_c]^\mu$ versus $[T/(\Delta S/S_c)^{z\nu}]^{1/2}$.







